

REMARKS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-36, and 38-48 are pending in the application, with Claims 1, 20, and 38 being independent. Claim 9 has been canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1, 10, 11, 18, 20, 36, and 38 have been amended. Support for the Claim amendments can be found in the original disclosure at least at paragraphs 0031 to 0039 and Figure 4.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Office objected to Claims 19 and 38 because of informalities. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

However, without conceding the propriety of the rejection, and for the sole purpose of advancing prosecution, Applicant has amended Claim 38 to omit the word “when” and has cancelled Claim 19. The objection to Claim 19 is now moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the objection to Claim 38 be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Office rejected Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,854,056 to Benantar et al. (Benantar). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection, and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance of the application, Applicant has cancelled Claim 19. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 19 is now moot.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office rejected Claims 1-4, 6, 8-18, 20-24, 26-36, and 38-48 as being unpatentable over Benantar. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 20, and 38 as agreed during the interview.

Amended Claims 1, 20, and 38 as amended recite in relevant part:

1. *...receiving a message having a first token and a second token, wherein the first token is in a first format and the second token is in a second format that is different from the first format, associated with a same subject;*

authenticating the first token by extracting a first claim from the first token and authenticating the second token by extracting a second claim from the second token, wherein the first and second claims comprise different statements about the subject...

20. *...a first module to extract a first claim from a first token and a second claim from a second token associated with a message, wherein the message has an associated subject and the first claim and the second claim comprise different statements related to the subject...*

38. *...receiving a message having a first token and a second token, wherein the first token is in a first format and the second token is in a second format that is different from the first format, associated with a same subject;*

obtaining a first claim from the first token and a second claim from the second token, wherein the first and second claims comprise different statements about the subject...

As agreed during the interview, amended Claims 1, 20, and 38 are allowable at least over the references of record in part because of the recitations of a first and a second token. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection of the claims and allowance of the claims.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8-18, 21-24, 26-36, and 39-48

Claims 2-4, 6, 8, 10-18, 21-24, 26-28, and 39-48 depend from independent Claims 1, 20, and 38 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency as well for as the additional features they recite.

Regarding Claim 9, without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejection, and for the sole purpose of advancing prosecution, Applicant has cancelled Claim 9. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 9 is now moot.

The Office rejected Claims 7 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benantar in view of XML Path Language (XPath) Version 1.0 to Clark et al. (Clark). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As presented above, Applicant and the Office agree that Benantar fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the elements of amended independent Claims 1 and 20. Clark was cited for allegedly disclosing "obtaining the resource from the message comprises applying an XPath expression," and therefore fails to cure the identified deficiency of Benantar.

Accordingly, Benantar and Clark, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of Claims 1 and 20.

Claims 7 and 25 depend from independent Claims 1 and 20, respectively, and are allowable by virtue of their dependency as well as the additional features they recite. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection of the claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-36, and 38-48 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter remain unresolved, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Date: June 17, 2008

By: /Benjamin Keim/
Benjamin A. Keim
Reg. No. 59,217
(509) 324-9256 ext. 248

Daniel L. Hayes
Reg. No. 34,618
(509) 324-9256 ext. 212